


Interview Summary

Application No.

10/780,774

Applicant(s)

SHIRAKAWA ET AL.

Examiner

TU M. NGUYEN

Art Unit

3748

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tu M. Nguyen (examiner).

(3) _____

(2) Thomas G. Bilodeau (attorney).

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 21 October 2008.Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 19-22.Identification of prior art discussed: Sawada et al. (U.S. Patent 6,263,667) and Ito et al. (U.S. Patent 5,655,363).Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's argument that Ito et al. fail to teach or suggest suspending an abnormality determination of a NOx catalyst, is persuasive; therefore, the claims are allowable pending further search and consideration.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Tu M. Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3748